

REMARKS & ARGUMENTS

Applicants provide the following remarks and argument for consideration in further examination of the present application and explanation of the amendments presented herein. Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 11-14, 16, 18, and 20-31 are currently pending. Claims 2 and 9 have been amended. New claims 32-35 have been added, and claims 7, 16, 20-22, and 26-28 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Claims 2-5, 9, 11-14, 18, 23-25, and 29-35 are pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). Specifically, the office alleges that “the ceasing the provision of at least one service in favor of allowing the second network to provide the at least one service of independent claim 2 and ceasing the implementation of the at least one service in the gateway in favor of allowing the second network to provide the at least one service must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).”

Applicant amended claims 2 to overcome the objection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to claim 2 and the drawings.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-5, 7, 11-14, 16, 20-22 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,683,883 to Czeiger, et al. (“Czeiger”), in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0024905 to Liao, et al. (“Liao”). Applicants respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 2, from which claims 3-5 and 32 depend, recites, *inter alia*, “wherein said second module ceases implementing said at least one service in favor of allowing the second network to provide the at least one service after said third module determines that the at least one service is implemented in the second network.” Claim 11, from which claims 12-14 and 33 depend, recites, *inter alia*, “ceasing the implementation of the at least one service in the gateway in favor of allowing the second network to provide the at least one service.”

The Office action alleges that the Liao reference discloses this limitation. The Liao reference discloses that virtual port assignments are preferably semi-permanent and that if a FC

device leaves the network and later returns, it is preferably re-connected in its previous virtual location. See, e.g., paragraphs [0051]. However, the Liao reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest that a second module ceases implementing said at least one service in favor of allowing the second network to provide the at least one service after said third module determines that the at least one service is implemented in the second network. Nor does the Czeiger reference overcome the deficiencies of the Liao reference. The Czeiger reference and the Liao reference, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all the limitations of claims 2-5, 11-14, 32, and 33 and, thus, fail to obviate claims 2-5, 11-14, 32, and 33. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-5, 11-14, 32, and 33 and allow claims 2-5, 11-14, 32, and 33.

Claims 9, 18, 23-25 and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Czeiger in view of Liao further in view Cho et al. (*A Method for Accommodating Storage Service in Optical Access System*) (“Cho”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 9 and 18, from which claims 23-25 and 29-31 depend, respectively, each recite, *inter alia*, “a security service implemented on behalf of the second network” and “implementing a security service on behalf of the second network,” respectively.

The Office alleges that this limitation is disclosed in the Cho reference and that, when combined with the Czeiger and Liao references obviates claims 9, 18, 23-25 and 29-31. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The security system disclosed in the Cho reference, however, is implemented in a sender device and a destination device and is not implemented within a network. Specifically, a sequence number is incremented by the sender, and the destination device discards frames received with a sequence number it has already processed. Thus, even if combined with the Czeiger and Liao references, a combination would fail to disclose, teach, or suggest a security service implemented on behalf of a network and such a combination would render the system of the Cho reference inoperable for its intended purpose.

Thus, the Czeiger reference in view of the Liao reference in further view of the Cho reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all the limitations of claims 9, 18, 23-25 and 29-31 and, thus, fail to obviate claims 9, 18, 23-25 and 29-31. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 9, 18, 23-25 and 29-31 and allow claims 9, 18, 23-25 and 29-31.

New Claims

Applicant has added new claims 32-35 in this Amendment. New claims 32 and 33 depend from independent claims 2 and 11, respectively, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 2 and 11. New independent claims 34 and 35 are likewise believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as described above with respect to claims 2 and 11.

Conclusion

Claims 2-5, 9, 11-14, 18, 23-25, and 29-35 are currently pending in the application. Applicants have fully responded to each and every objection and rejection in the Office action dated 02 October 2009 and believe that claims 2-5, 9, 11-14, 18, 23-25, and 29-35 are in a condition for allowance. Applicants therefore request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants believe no further fees or petitions are required. However, if any such petitions or fees are necessary, please consider this a request therefore and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3199 accordingly.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or believes any issues could be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted this 4th day of January 2010.

/Thomas J. Osborne, Jr./

Thomas J. Osborne, Jr.
Registration No. 39,796
Customer No. 48929

HENSLEY KIM & HOLZER, LLC
1660 Lincoln Street, Suite 3000
Denver, Colorado 80264
720-377-0773 (TEL)
720-377-0777 (FAX)